

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Anthony L. Mann,	)	C/A No. 0:14-1647-RMG-PJG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Captain C. Williams; Captain Rhonda Abston,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	


The plaintiff, Anthony L. Mann, a self-represented state prisoner, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the named defendants. This matter is before the court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) DSC for pretrial proceedings.

Mann alleges that the defendants used excessive force and were deliberately indifferent to his medical needs regarding an incident in which Mann was sprayed with chemical munitions. Mann filed a motion to compel which, in relevant part, sought an order compelling the defendants to produce a copy of the relevant portion of the South Carolina Department of Corrections policy that details the steps required to decontaminate a prisoner who has been exposed to chemical munitions. (ECF No. 46 at 4-5.) The defendants objected to this production on the bases that the request “is vague and ambiguous as written,” “is neither relevant to a claim or defense in this action, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence,” and “is overly broad and therefore unduly burdensome,” and object to the request to the extent “it seeks information or documents not in the possession, custody or control of Defendants,” and to the extent “the information requested by [Mann] is restricted, as its production would jeopardize the safety of the

officers and staff at SCDC, and would impede on their ability to maintain proper order within SCDC's institutions." (See Pl.'s Request for Prod. No. 8, ECF No. 49-1.)

Upon review, the court finds that this discovery request may be relevant to Mann's claims in this matter. The defendants are hereby granted fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order to respond in writing providing legal authority for their objections to Mann's request, specifically including the basis for their contention that production of the decontamination portions of the policy presents a security risk. Additionally, the defendants are directed to produce any documents responsive Request for Production No. 8 to the court for *in camera* review.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

February 3, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina